

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration and entry of this amendment based upon the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 14-17, 22, 24, 45-47, 50, 53, 55, 58-60, 68-70, 73, 76, 78 and 81-83 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. in view of Watanabe et al. and Rampe and Claims 31-35, 38-42 and 61-65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. in view of Nelson and Rampe.

Considering first then the rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 9, 11, 14-17, 22, 24, 45-47, 50, 53, 55, 58-60, 68-70, 73, 76, 78 and 81-83 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tsutsui et al. in view of Watanabe et al. and in view of Rampe, Applicants note that the limitations set forth in Claims 31 and 38 has been added to Claim 1 which claim that the at least one through hole on the attachment strip is formed so as to have an elongation so that a position at which the pulley is attached to the drive shaft is adjustable. In view of the fact that this limitation now being added to each independent claim with the exception of Claims 31 and 38 in which it already appears, such therefore does not raise new issues and/or considerations and thus merits entry. In addition, it is submitted that the prior art of record does not teach or disclose this limitation. In this regard, it is noted that the Examiner has cited the reference to Nelson, as explained on pages 17 and 18 of the Office Action, as teaching a pulley part 1 attached with a screw through hole 20 to a hole 22 of a pulley part 2, wherein at least one of the attachment holes is formed so as to have an elongation so that the position at which a corresponding one of the pulley parts “is attached to the pulley shaft” is adjustable with respect to the pulley shaft. It is to be noted, however, that Claim 1 as well as the other independent claims now claims that the at least one through hole formed in the attachment strip is for inserting a fixing member to secure the attachment member to the drive shaft. To the contrary, the through hole shown in Nelson is for the purpose of

permitting adjustment of one part of a V-shaped pulley with respect to the other part of the pulley such that the first part is fixed in position with respect to the shaft on which the pulley is mounted. Thus, the fixing member 21 in Nelson only fixes the position of one part of the pulley with respect to the other part of the pulley. More particularly, as discussed at page 2, lines 85-101:

The preferred means of securing the inner and outer cylindric bodies and their flanges at desired selective positions with respect to each other includes angled slots 20 in the outer cylindric body 16 through which screws 21 may extend and be screwed into suitable threaded apertures 22 in the inner cylindric body and reinforcing plates 23 therefor as may be desired, whereby by unscrewing the screw 21 and rotating the outer cylindric body upon the inner cylindric body, the angled slots 20 will vary the longitudinal distance between the opposed faces 18 and 19 of the V groove faces, and the desired distance between the faces may then be fixed and secured by tightening of the screws. (emphases added)

As can thus be appreciated, Nelson does not teach a combination of a through hole on an attachment strip and a fixing member for securing the attachment member to the drive shaft as presently claimed. Thus, even if Nelson were considered to be combinable with Tsutsui et al. and Rampe, which Applicants contend is not the case, such would not result in Applicants' claimed invention.

Applicants further note that in view of the different structure and functioning of the V-shaped pulley in Nelson, which serves to adjust longitudinal distance between opposed faces 18 and 19 of the V-shaped groove faces of the pulley of Nelson rather than adjusting the position of the pulley on a shaft in the manner claimed in the present invention, Nelson is not obviously combinable with Tsutsui et al. or Rampe. Furthermore, even if combined, Nelson would only teach adjusting opposite flanges of a pulley so as to be adjustable with respect to one another and to reform the flat faced pulleys of Tsutsui et al. to instead be V-shaped in the manner taught by Nelson. This, however, is not what Applicants presently claims.

A review of the remaining references of record also fails to indicate a teaching or disclosure of any reference teaching the limitations now added to each of the independent claims as mentioned above. It is therefore submitted that each of independent Claims 1, 17, 19, 22, 25, 31, 38 and 45 patentably defines over the prior art of record and that all claims depend from the above-noted claims also merit indication of allowability.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:JDH\la\my



James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648

James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421
Attorneys of Record